arXiv:1405.3682v1 [math.CV] 14 May 2014

SUFFRIDGE'S CONVOLUTION THEOREM FOR POLYNOMIALS WITH ZEROS IN THE UNIT DISK

MARTIN LAMPRECHT

Abstract. In 1976 Suffridge proved an intruiging theorem regarding the convolution of polynomials with zeros only on the unit circle. His result generalizes a special case of the fundamental Grace-Szegö convolution theorem, but so far it is an open problem whether there is a Suffridge-like extension of the general Grace-Szegö convolution theorem. In this paper we try to approach this question from two different directions: First, we show that Suffridge's convolution theorem holds for a certain class of polynomials with zeros in the unit disk and thus obtain an extension of one further special case of the Grace-Szegö convolution theorem. Second, we present non-circular zero domains which stay invariant under the Grace-Szegö convolution hoping that this will lead to further analogs of Suffridge's convolution theorem.

1. Introduction

In 1922 Szegö [19] found the following rephrasing of a theorem of Grace [3] from 1902 regarding the zeros of apolar polynomials.

Theorem 1 (Grace-Szegö)**.** *Let*

$$F(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} a_k z^k \quad \text{and} \quad G(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} b_k z^k$$

be polynomials of degree $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose $K \subset \mathbb{C}$ is an open or closed disk or half-plane that contains all zeros of F. Then each zero γ of

$$F *_{GS} G(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} a_k b_k z^k$$

is of the form $\gamma = -\alpha\beta$ with $\alpha \in K$ and $G(\beta) = 0$. If $G(0) \neq 0$, this also holds when K is the open or closed exterior of a disk.

This result is usually called the *Grace-Szegö convolution theorem* (or simply *Grace's theorem*), since the *convolution* or *Hadamard product* of two functions $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$ and $g(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_k z^k$, analytic in a neighborhood of the origin, is given by

$$(f * g)(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k b_k z^k.$$

The weighted convolution $F *_{GS} G$ appearing in Grace's theorem is called the *Grace-Szegö convolution* of F and G.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30C10, 30C15.

Key words and phrases. Suffridge polynomials, Grace's theorem.

The Grace-Szegö convolution theorem, together with its many equivalent forms (cf. [9, Ch. 3], [17, Ch. 5]), is perhaps the single most important result regarding the zero location of complex polynomials. For instance, since

$$F *_{GS} z(1+z)^{n-1} = z\frac{F'(z)}{n} \tag{1}$$

for every polynomial F of degree n, it is easy to see that Grace's theorem implies the following fundamental fact.

Theorem 2 (Gauß-Lucas)**.** *The convex hull of the zeros of a polynomial F contains all zeros of F'.*

More generally, Grace's theorem can be used to obtain information about the relation between zeros and critical points of polynomials. It therefore seems reasonable to hope that a better understanding of Grace's theorem will lead to progress on long-standing open problems such as the conjectures of Sendov or Smale (cf. [9, Ch. 7], [17, Ch. 6, 10.4]).

In [15] Ruscheweyh and Sheil-Small were able to settle a famous conjecture of Pólya and Schoenberg [8] regarding the convolution invariance of schlicht convex mappings. Shortly afterwards Suffridge [18] found an intruiging extension of a special case of Grace's theorem which enabled him to generalize Ruscheweyh's and Sheil-Small's theorem. Subsequently, more extensions of Suffridge's theorem and other special cases of Grace's theorem were found by Ruscheweyh, Salinas, Sheil-Small, and the author (cf. [6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17]). The extensions of Grace's theorem found in these papers show strong similarities; it thus seems very likely that there should be a generalization of Grace's theorem which unifies all partial extensions that have been discovered until now.

In this paper we will present two additional extensions of Grace's theorem of a spirit similar to the one exhibited in [6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17]. We hope that this will be of help in finding the desired unified extension of Grace's theorem.

1.1. **The main result: An extension of Suffridge's convolution theorem to polynomials with zeros in the unit disk.** Denote by $\pi_n(\Omega)$ and $\pi_{\leq n}(\Omega)$ the sets of polynomials of degree n and $\leq n$, respectively, which have zeros only in the set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. For certain Ω Grace's theorem leads to interesting invariance results concerning the classes $\pi_n(\Omega)$ or $\pi_{\leq n}(\Omega)$. For instance, if $F \in \pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ and $G \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$, where $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ denotes the open unit disk, then it follows from Grace's theorem that $F *_{GS} G \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$. On the other hand, if G of degree n is such that $F *_{GS} G \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ for all $F \in \pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$, then the special choice $F = (1+z)^n$ yields $G \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$. Hence, the following is true.

Corollary 3. *Let G be a polynomial of degree n. Then $F *_{GS} G \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ for all $F \in \pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ if, and only if, $G \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$.*

The same holds with $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\mathbb{D}$ replaced by $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$ and $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, respectively. Combining these two special cases of Grace's theorem one obtains the following result concerning polynomials with zeros only on the unit circle $\mathbb{T} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$.

Corollary 4. *Let G be a polynomial of degree n. Then $F *_{GS} G \in \pi_n(\mathbb{T})$ for all $F \in \pi_n(\mathbb{T})$ if, and only if, $G \in \pi_n(\mathbb{T})$.*

In [18] Suffridge found an intruiging extension of Corollary 4. In order to state his results, recall that the *q-binomial* or *Gaussian central coefficients* $\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q$ are defined by (cf. [5] or [1, Ch. 10] as general references regarding q-binomial coefficients)

$$R_n(q;z) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} q^{k(k-1)/2} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q z^k := \prod_{j=1}^{n} (1+q^{j-1}z), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N},\ q \in \mathbb{C}. \tag{2}$$

For reasons of brevity, in the following, for $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n}]$, we use the notation

$$Q_n(\lambda;z) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} C_k^{(n)}(\lambda) z^k := \prod_{j=1}^{n} (1+e^{i(2j-n-1)\lambda/2}z), \tag{3}$$

such that

$$Q_n(\lambda;z) = R_n(e^{i\lambda}; e^{-i(n+1)\lambda/2}z) \quad \text{and} \quad C_k^{(n)}(\lambda) := e^{ik(k-n-2)\lambda/2} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_{e^{i\lambda}}. \tag{4}$$

Then

$$Q_n(0;z) = (1+z)^n, \quad \text{and thus} \quad C_k^{(n)}(0) = \binom{n}{k}, \qquad k = 0, \dots, n, \tag{5}$$

and

$$Q_n(\tfrac{2\pi}{n};z) = 1 + z^n. \tag{6}$$

We call a polynomial of the form $F(z) = a\, Q_n(\lambda; bz)$, with $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $b \in \mathbb{T}$, a *λ-extremal polynomial*. It is well known (cf. [18] or [17, Ch. 7]) that

$$C_k^{(n)}(\lambda) = \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{n} \sin(j\lambda/2)}{\prod_{j=1}^{k} \sin(j\lambda/2) \prod_{j=1}^{n-k} \sin(j\lambda/2)} \neq 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda \in (0, \tfrac{2\pi}{n}). \tag{7}$$

Hence, for all $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$, every pair of polynomials F, G of degree n can be written in the form

$$F(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} C_k^{(n)}(\lambda) a_k z^k, \qquad G(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} C_k^{(n)}(\lambda) b_k z^k,$$

and we can define

$$F *_\lambda G(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} C_k^{(n)}(\lambda) a_k b_k z^k. \tag{8}$$

Then, because of (5),

$$F *_0 G = F *_{GS} G. \tag{9}$$

All zeros of $Q_n(\lambda;z)$ lie on $\mathbb{T}$ with each (except one) pair of consecutive zeros separated by an angle of exactly λ. Suffridge [18] introduced the classes $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ of polynomials in which $Q_n(\lambda;z)$ is the natural extremal element (note, however, that in [18] the classes $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ are denoted by $\mathcal{P}_n(\lambda)$). More exactly, the classes $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ are defined to consist of all polynomials of degree n that have zeros only on $\mathbb{T}$ with each pair of zeros separated by an angle of at least λ. $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ shall denote the set of those F in $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ for which every pair of zeros is separated by an angle $> \lambda$. With these definitions we have that $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\frac{2\pi}{n}) = \{a(1+bz^n) : a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}, b \in \mathbb{T}\}$, $\mathcal{T}_n(\frac{2\pi}{n}) = \varnothing$, $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(0) = \pi_n(\mathbb{T})$, and that $\mathcal{T}_n(0)$ is the set of those $f \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(0)$ which have only simple zeros.

In the following, for every class $\mathcal{C}_n(\lambda)$ of polynomials of degree n depending on $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$, we define the *pre-coefficient classes* $\mathcal{PC}_n(\lambda)$ to consist of all

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k z^k \quad \text{for which} \quad f * Q_n(\lambda; z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} C_k^{(n)}(\lambda) a_k z^k \in \mathcal{C}_n(\lambda).$$

For instance, $\mathcal{P}\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ is the class of those polynomials f for which $f * Q_n(\lambda; z)$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$. The polynomials $a\sum_{k=0}^{n} b^k z^k$, with $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $b \in \mathbb{T}$, will belong to every pre-coefficient class considered, and will be called *pre-extremal polynomials*.

Suffridge's main results from [18] can now be stated as follows (see also [7] for a different proof, and note that (c) is an equivalent form of one of Suffridge's result from [18] which can be deduced from [17, Thm. 7.6.9]).

Theorem 5 (Suffridge)**.** *Let $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$.*

(a) *If G is a polynomial of degree n, then $F *_\lambda G \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ for all $F \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, $G \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$.*
(b) *If $\lambda < \mu < \frac{2\pi}{n}$ and $f \in \mathcal{P}\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ is not pre-extremal, then $f \in \mathcal{PT}_n(\mu)$.*
(c) *Let $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k z^k$ be a polynomial of degree n whose zeros lie symmetrically around $\mathbb{T}$. Then f belongs to $\mathcal{PT}_n(\lambda)$ for a $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ if, and only if,*

$$\frac{f(z) - a_0}{a_n z^n - a_0} \quad \textit{maps} \quad \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}} \quad \textit{n-fold onto the half-plane} \quad \operatorname{Re} z > \frac{1}{2}.$$

For $\lambda = 0$ Theorem 5a (which will be called Suffridge's convolution theorem from now on) is essentially equal to the $\mathbb{T}$-special case of Grace's theorem stated in Corollary 4. Because of (2) and (4), Suffridge's convolution theorem constitutes a q-extension of this special case, albeit only for q of the form $q = e^{i\lambda}$.

It is so far unknown whether there is an extension of Grace's theorem which includes Suffridge's convolution theorem as a special case. In order to look for such an extension, it seems a promising approach to check whether there are Suffridge-type extensions for other special cases of Grace's theorem. In [6] such extensions were found for the 'half-plane cases' of Grace's theorem (cf. Corollaries 18 and 19 below). However, until now it was not clear how the corresponding extension of Corollary 3 should look like. This is mainly due to the fact that it is not obvious what the 'natural' analog of the zero separation condition, used to define the classes $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$, should be, if one considers polynomials with zeros in $\mathbb{D}$. We do not have an answer to this question yet, but the main result of this paper is an analog of Theorem 5 for certain sets $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \supset \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$, containing polynomials with zeros in $\mathbb{D}$, whose definition is motivated as follows:

For $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ and a polynomial F of degree $\leq n$ set

$$\begin{aligned} F_+(z) &:= F_{+,\lambda}(z) := F(e^{i\lambda/2} z) = F *_\lambda Q_n(\lambda; e^{i\lambda/2} z) \quad \text{and} \\ F_-(z) &:= F_{-,\lambda}(z) := F(e^{-i\lambda/2} z) = F *_\lambda Q_n(\lambda; e^{-i\lambda/2} z). \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Using [17, Thms. 7.2.4, 7.5.2], it is easy to see that the following holds.

Lemma 6. *Let $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$. A polynomial F of degree n belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, the rational function*

$$e^{-in\lambda/2} \frac{F_+(z)}{F_-(z)}$$

maps $\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ onto the open upper half-plane. Every point in the open upper half-plane has exactly n pre-images in $\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ under this mapping if, and only if, $F\in\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$.

This result gives the motivation to consider the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$, $\lambda\in(0,\frac{2\pi}{n})$, of all polynomials F of degree n for which

$$\operatorname{Im}\left(e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{F_+(z)}{F_-(z)}\right)>0,\qquad z\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{\mathbb{D}}. \tag{11}$$

We also define $\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ as the union of $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ with the set of all polynomials F of degree n for which

$$\operatorname{Im}\left(e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{F_+(z)}{F_-(z)}\right)>0,\qquad z\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}. \tag{12}$$

These definitions imply that $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\subset\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)\subset\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$. The inclusions are strict, since $z^n\in\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda\in(0,\frac{2\pi}{n})$. Moreover, it readily follows from (11) and (12) that $\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)\setminus\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)\subseteq\pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ and $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)\subseteq\pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ for all $\lambda\in(0,\frac{2\pi}{n})$. We will explain later (cf. Theorem 9 below) why it is natural to set

$$\begin{aligned}&\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\tfrac{2\pi}{n}):=\{a(z^n-b):a\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\},b\in\overline{\mathbb{D}}\},\qquad \mathcal{D}_n(\tfrac{2\pi}{n}):=\varnothing,\\ &\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(0):=\pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}}),\qquad\text{and}\qquad \mathcal{D}_n(0):=\pi_n(\mathbb{D})\cup\mathcal{T}_n(0).\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

These properties of the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ show that the next result is a q-extension of Corollary 3 which also contains Theorem 5 (for the definition of the n-inverse f^{*n} of f appearing in Statement (b), see Section 1.2 below).

Theorem 7. *Let $\lambda\in[0,\frac{2\pi}{n})$.*

(a) *If G is a polynomial of degree n, then $F*_\lambda G\in\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ for all $F\in\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, $G\in\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$.*

(b) *If $\lambda<\mu<\frac{2\pi}{n}$ and if $f\in\mathcal{P}\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ is such that $f+\zeta f^{*n}$ is not pre-extremal for any $\zeta\in\mathbb{T}$, then $f\in\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_n(\mu)$.*

(c) *Let $f(z)=\sum_{k=0}^n a_kz^k$ be of degree n with $|a_0|<|a_n|$. There is a $\lambda\in[0,\frac{2\pi}{n})$ such that f belongs to $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)\setminus\mathcal{P}\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if,*

$$\operatorname{Re}\frac{f(z)-a_0}{a_nz^n-a_0}>\frac{1}{2},\qquad z\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}.$$

Even though this is the desired extension of Suffridge's theorem to polynomials with zeros in $\mathbb{D}$, Theorem 7 remains unsatisfactory, since we do not have an explicit description of the zero location of polynomials in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$. Such a description would in particular be important for obtaining a q-analog of a very useful reformulation of Grace's theorem which is due to Walsh (cf. [9, Thm. 3.4.1b] or [17, Thm. 5.2.7]), or for finding Suffridge-type extensions of the special cases of Grace's theorem which are presented in Section 1.3 below.

We therefore regard the following as the main open problem concerning the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$.

Problem 1. Given $\lambda\in[0,\frac{2\pi}{n})$, is it possible to describe the zero configurations of polynomials in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$?

In the next section we will present several further properties of the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$, hoping that this will be of help for finding an answer to Problem 1.

1.2. **Further properties and characterizations of the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$.** By definition, a polynomial $F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ either has all its zeros on $\mathbb{T}$ (in this case F belongs to $\mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$), or all in $\mathbb{D}$ (in this case F satisfies (12)). Even though this does not follow directly from their definition, the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ can be partitioned in the same way.

Theorem 8. *If $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n}]$, has one zero on $\mathbb{T}$, then $F \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ (and thus has all zeros on $\mathbb{T}$).*

Note, however, that $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ is contained in the closure of $\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, since by (12), Lemma 6, and the maximum principle, we have $F(rz) \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ for every $F \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ and all $r > 1$.

The *n-inverse* of a polynomial F of degree $\le n$ is defined as $F^{*n}(z) := z^n \overline{F(1/\overline{z})}$. It is a well known property of finite Blaschke products that for a polynomial F of degree n with at least one zero in $\mathbb{D}$ we have

$$F \in \pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \quad \text{if, and only if,} \quad F + \zeta F^{*n} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(0) \quad \text{for all} \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{T}, \tag{14}$$

and

$$F \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D}) \quad \text{if, and only if,} \quad F + \zeta F^{*n} \in \mathcal{T}_n(0) \quad \text{for all} \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{T}. \tag{15}$$

The next result therefore justifies the definitions (13) from above. It also shows that the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ are decreasing with respect to λ.

Theorem 9 (First equivalent characterization of the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$)**.** *Let $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ and suppose $F \in \pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Then*

$$F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda) \quad \textit{if, and only if,} \quad F + \zeta F^{*n} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda) \quad \textit{for all} \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{T}, \tag{16}$$

and

$$F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \quad \textit{if, and only if,} \quad F + \zeta F^{*n} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \quad \textit{for all} \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{T}. \tag{17}$$

Moreover, if $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ and if there is a $z_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$e^{-in\lambda/2} \frac{F_+(z_0)}{F_-(z_0)} = x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad \textit{then} \quad \lim_{z \to z_0} e^{-in\lambda/2} \frac{(F + \zeta F^{*n})_+(z)}{(F + \zeta F^{*n})_-(z)} = x \quad \textit{for all} \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{T}.$$

A polynomial F of degree $\le n$ is called *n-self-inversive* if $F = F^{*n}$. The zeros of n-self-inversive polynomials lie symmetrically around $\mathbb{T}$, and for every F, lying in the set $\mathcal{ST}_n$ of polynomials of degree $\le n$ whose zeros lie symmetrically around $\mathbb{T}$, there is a uniquely determined $c_F \in \{e^{it} : t \in [0, \pi)\}$ such that $c_F F$ is n-self-inversive, i.e. such that

$$(c_F F)^{*n} = c_F F. \tag{18}$$

Of course, every $F \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ belongs to $\mathcal{ST}_n$ and thus, for such F,

$$F + \zeta F^{*n} = (1 + \zeta c_F^2) F \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda) \tag{19}$$

for all except one $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$. Hence, essentially Theorem 9 also holds for the classes $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$.

If $F(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n C_k^{(n)}(\lambda) a_k z^k$ is of degree $\le n$ and $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$, then it follows from (7) that

$$\Delta_\lambda^n[F](z) := \frac{F_+(z) - F_-(z)}{2iz \sin \frac{n\lambda}{2}} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} C_k^{(n-1)}(\lambda) a_{k+1} z^k. \tag{20}$$

The operator Δ_λ^n can be used to characterize the classes $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ (cf. [18] or [17, Thm. 7.5.1]).

Theorem 10 (Suffridge's q-extension of the Gauß-Lucas theorem for $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$)**.** *Let $F \in \mathcal{ST}_n$ and $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$. Then $F \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, $\Delta_\lambda^n[F] \in \pi_{n-1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Furthermore, $F \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, $\Delta_\lambda^n[F] \in \pi_{n-1}(\mathbb{D})$.*

From (20) one can readily deduce that

$$\Delta_\lambda^n[F] \to \frac{F'}{n} \qquad \text{as} \qquad \lambda \to 0.$$

This gives the justification for setting $\Delta_0^n[F] := F'/n$ and explains why the above theorem is in fact a q-extension of the theorem of Gauß-Lucas.

Theorem 10 does not carry over completely to the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$. Nevertheless, we have the following q-extension of the theorem of Gauß-Lucas for the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$.

Theorem 11 (q-extension of the Gauß-Lucas theorem for $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$)**.** *Let $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ and $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$. Then $\Delta_\lambda^n[F] \in \pi_{n-1}(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. Furthermore, if $F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$, then $\Delta_\lambda^n[F] \in \pi_{n-1}(\mathbb{D})$.*

As shown in [7, Thm. 18], for a polynomial F of degree n we have $F = P - Q$ with $P, Q \in \mathcal{ST}_n$ and $c_P \neq c_Q$ if, and only if, there are $\eta, \zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ with $\eta \neq \zeta$ such that

$$P = \frac{\eta^2 F - F^{*n}}{\eta^2 - \zeta^2} \quad \text{and} \quad Q = \frac{\zeta^2 F - F^{*n}}{\eta^2 - \zeta^2}. \tag{21}$$

In fact, if at least one zero of F lies in $\mathbb{D}$, then the Hermite-Biehler theorem (cf. Lemma 22 below) states that $F \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ if, and only if, P and Q belong to $\pi_n(\mathbb{T})$ and have strictly interspersed zeros. Theorems 8 and 9 thus imply the following.

Lemma 12. *Let $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$. Then for P and Q as defined in (21) (with η, $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, $\eta \neq \zeta$) we have $P, Q \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$, $P \curlyvee Q$, and $F = P - Q$. If $F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, then additionally $P, Q \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$.*

The converse of this statement does not hold, i.e. if there are $P, Q \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ with $P \curlyvee Q$, then it is not necessarily true that $F = P - Q$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ (cf. the remarks following Theorem 15 below). We have, however, the following two characterizations of the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ in terms of the decomposition $F = P - Q$.

Theorem 13 (Second equivalent characterization of the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$)**.** *Let $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$. Suppose $P, Q \in \pi_n(\mathbb{T})$ are such that $c_P \neq c_Q$ and set $F := P - Q$. Then $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if,*

$$R := \frac{c_P \Delta_\lambda^n[P]}{c_Q \Delta_\lambda^n[Q]}$$

maps $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ into the upper or lower half-plane. Moreover, $F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, R maps $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$ into the open upper or lower half-plane.

Theorem 14 (Third equivalent characterization of the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$)**.** *Let $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$. Suppose $P, Q \in \pi_n(\mathbb{T})$ are such that $c_P \neq c_Q$ and set $F := P - Q$ and*

$$S := P_+ \cdot Q_- - P_- \cdot Q_+, \quad \text{and} \quad T := F_+ \cdot (F^{*n})_- - F_- \cdot (F^{*n})_+. \tag{22}$$

Then the following holds:

(a) *If $F \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ and all zeros of S or T that lie on $\mathbb{T}$ are of even order, then $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$.*
(b) *If $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$, then all zeros of S and T on $\mathbb{T}$ are of even order.*
(c) *If $F \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ and if S or T has exactly $n-1$ critical points in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then $F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$.*
(d) *If $F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, then S and T have exactly $n-1$ critical points in $\mathbb{D}$.*

By [17, Thm. 7.1.3] the polynomial T in (22) has exactly $n-1$ critical points in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ if, and only if, it does not vanish on $\mathbb{T}$. Hence, another way to state Theorem 14 would be that F belongs to $\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, the finite Blaschke product $B := F/F^{*n}$ satisfies

$$B(e^{i\lambda/2}z) \neq B(e^{-i\lambda/2}z) \quad \text{for all} \quad z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

The following is thus merely a reformulation of Problem 1.

Problem 2. Let $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$. Is it possible to obtain a description of the zero configurations of those Blaschke products of degree n that map every arc on $\mathbb{T}$ of length λ onto an arc of length less than 2π?

Observe that Theorem 14 provides a feasible way to check whether a given polynomial F belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ or not. In general, however, we cannot give many concrete examples of polynomials in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$. At the moment the only polynomials in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ which we know concretely are (1) all polynomials in $\overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$, (2) all polynomials whose zeros lie in $|z| < r_{n,\lambda}$, where $r_{n,\lambda}$ is a number in $(0,1)$ whose existence follows from the fact that $z^n \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$, and (3) all polynomials of the form $F(rz)$ where F is any given polynomial in $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ and $r > 1$ (this follows directly from the definition of the classes $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$). A perhaps more interesting subset of $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$) is presented in the next theorem.

Theorem 15. *Let $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ and suppose $P \in \pi_n(\mathbb{T})$. Then $F(z) := P(z) - Q_n(\lambda; z)$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, there are $c \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{\pm 1\}$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \neq 0$, such that*

$$P(z) = c\left(b + a\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{e^{i(k-n-1)\frac{\lambda}{2}}}{\sin\frac{(k-n-1)\lambda}{2}} \frac{1 + e^{i(n+1)\frac{\lambda}{2}}z}{1 + e^{i(2k-n-1)\frac{\lambda}{2}}z}\right) Q_n(\lambda; z). \tag{23}$$

By definition of the classes $\mathcal{P}\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ Theorem 7b can also be stated in the following form: if $\lambda < \mu < \frac{2\pi}{n}$ and if $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ is such that $F + \zeta F^{*n}$ is not λ-extremal for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, then $F *_\lambda Q_n(\mu; z) \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mu)$. Theorem 15 shows that there are in fact $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ with the property that $F + \zeta F^{*n}$ is λ-extremal for a $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$. For, if $F = P - Q_n(\lambda; z)$ with P as in Theorem 15, then $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$, and $F - c^2F^{*n} = (c^2 - 1)Q_n(\lambda; z)$.

Since by Theorem 15 the set of polynomials P for which $F = P - Q_n(\lambda; z)$ belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ is a three-parameter family, it is clear that for large enough n there will be a polynomial $P \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ with $P \vee Q_n(\lambda)$ such that $F = P - Q$ does not belong to $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$. This proves that the converse of Lemma 12 does not hold.

Next, let $\mathcal{R}_1$ denote the set of functions f analytic in $\mathbb{D}$ for which $f(0) = 1$ and $\operatorname{Re} f(z) > \frac{1}{2}$ for $z \in \mathbb{D}$. In [18] Suffridge showed that $f \in \mathcal{R}_1$ if, and only if, there are sequences $(n_k)_k \subset \mathbb{N}$, $(\lambda_k)_k$, and $(p_k)_k$, with $n_k \geq k$, $\lambda_k \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n_k})$, $p_k \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{T}_{n_k}(\lambda_k)$, and $p_k(0) = 1$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $p_k \to f$ uniformly on compact subsets of

$\mathbb{D}$ as $k \to \infty$. One might hope that the limits of polynomials in the larger class $\mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda)$ (in fact, limits of the n-inverses of polynomials in $\mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda)$, since we want convergence in $\mathbb{D}$) constitute a larger class of functions than $\mathcal{R}_1$, but this is not the case.

Theorem 16. *Let f be analytic in $\mathbb{D}$ with $f(0) = 1$. If there is a strictly increasing sequence $(n_k)_k \subset \mathbb{N}$, and sequences $(\lambda_k)_k$ and $(p_k)_k$ with $\lambda_k \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n_k})$, $p_k \in \mathcal{PD}_{n_k}(\lambda_k)$, and $p_k^{n_k *}(0) = 1$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $p_k^{*n_k} \to f$ uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{D}$ as $k \to \infty$, then $f \in \mathcal{R}_1$.*

The proofs of Theorems 7c and 16, as well as Suffridge's approximation technique from [18], have led us to a new proof of the following version of the Herglotz representation formula.

Theorem 17 (Herglotz representation formula [4])**.** *A function f analytic in $\mathbb{D}$ satisfies $f(0) = 1$ and $\operatorname{Re} f(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$ if, and only if, there is a strictly increasing sequence $(m_n)_n \subset \mathbb{N}$ and positive numbers $s_k^{(n)}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, m_n\}$ with $s_1^{(n)} + \cdots + s_{m_n}^{(n)} = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$f(z) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} s_k^{(n)} \frac{1 + e^{2\pi i k/m_n} z}{1 - e^{2\pi i k/m_n} z} \qquad \text{uniformly on compact subsets of } \mathbb{D}.$$

We will present our new proof of the Herglotz representation formula, together with the proofs of all other results in this paper, in Section 3.

1.3. **A continuous transition between the disk and half-plane cases of the Grace-Szegö convolution theorem.** Since they stem from the choice $K = \overline{\mathbb{D}}$, Corollaries 3 and 4 can be regarded as 'disk cases' of the Grace-Szegö convolution theorem. If we consider K to be equal to a half-plane, then the following 'half-plane case' can be deduced from Grace's theorem in the same way as Corollary 3 (note that $1 + az \to 1$ as $a \to 0$, which explains why in the case of unbounded sets we can also make statements about polynomials of degree $< n$).

Corollary 18. *Let H be a closed half-plane whose boundary contains the origin and suppose Q is of degree $\le n$. Then $P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_{\le n}(H)$ for all $P \in \pi_{\le n}(H)$ if, and only if, $Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{R}_0^-)$, where $\mathbb{R}_0^- := \{z \in \mathbb{R} : z \le 0\}$.*

By considering H to be equal to the upper, lower, and left half-plane, this implies the following.

Corollary 19. *Let Q be of degree $\le n$. Then $P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $P \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{R})$ if, and only if, $Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{R}_0^-)$, and $P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{R}_0^-)$ for all $P \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{R}_0^-)$ if, and only if, $Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{R}_0^-)$.*

Disks and half-planes are obvious candidates when looking for zero regions in the complex plane that stay invariant under the Grace-Szegö convolution since they appear explicitly in the statement of Grace's theorem. It seems, however, that until now the question whether there is a continuous transition between the disk and the half-plane cases has not been considered. This is even more surprising since very recently the question of linear mappings in $\mathbb{C}_n[z]$ which preserve $\pi_n(\Omega)$ for disks, half-planes, and their boundaries, was completely solved by Borcea and Brändén [2] (see also [11, Thm. 1.1] for the linear preservers of $\pi_n(\mathbb{D})$).

Our interest in this question was strongly motivated by a recent series of papers by Ruscheweyh and Salinas (and Sugawa) [12, 13, 14], in which a limit version of

Theorem 5 is extended to domains other than $\mathbb{D}$. More exactly, as explained in [13], for every open disk or half-plane Ω that contains the origin there are two unique parameters $\tau \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\gamma \in [0,1]$ such that Ω is the image of $\mathbb{D}$ under a Möbius transformation of the form

$$w_{\tau,\gamma}(z) := \frac{\tau z}{1+\gamma z}.$$

We write $\Omega_{\tau,\gamma}$ for such a circular domain and note that, for all $\tau \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $\Omega_{\tau,0}$ is a disk centered at the origin and $\Omega_{\tau,1}$ is an open half-plane containing the origin. For $\gamma \in [0,1)$ we also define

$$I_\gamma := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| + \gamma|1+z| < 1\},$$
$$O_\gamma := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| - \gamma|1+z| > 1\}.$$

$\overline{I}_\gamma$ and $\overline{O}_\gamma$ are families of sets which, when γ increases from 0 to 1, decrease from $\overline{I}_0 = \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\overline{O}_0 = \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$ to

$$\overline{I}_1 := \bigcap_{\gamma\in[0,1)} \overline{I}_\gamma = [-1,0] \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{O}_1 := \bigcap_{\gamma\in[0,1)} \overline{O}_\gamma = (-\infty,-1], \tag{24}$$

respectively. For $\gamma \in (0,1)$, I_γ is the interior of the inner loop of the limacon of Pascal, and O_γ is the open exterior of the limacon of Pascal. See [13] and the figures therein and note that, with L_γ and Ω_γ^* as defined there, we have $I_\gamma = -L_\gamma$ and $O_\gamma = -\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\Omega}_\gamma^*$.

The non-circular sets I_γ and O_γ are zero-domains which stay invariant under Grace-Szegö convolution.

Theorem 20. *Let $\tau \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $\gamma \in [0,1)$, and suppose Q is of degree $\le n$. Then*

(a) *$P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_n(\Omega_{\tau,\gamma})$ for all $P \in \pi_n(\overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma})$ if, and only if, $Q \in \pi_n(I_\gamma)$,*
(b) *$P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_n(\Omega_{\tau,\gamma})$ for all $P \in \pi_n(\Omega_{\tau,\gamma})$ if, and only if, $Q \in \pi_n(\overline{I}_\gamma)$,*
(c) *$P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma})$ for all $P \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C}\setminus\Omega_{\tau,\gamma})$ if, and only if, $Q \in \pi_{\le n}(O_\gamma)$,*
(d) *$P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma})$ for all $P \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C}\setminus\overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma})$ if, and only if, $Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\overline{O}_\gamma)$,*
(e) *$P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_n(I_\gamma)$ for all $P \in \pi_n(\overline{I}_\gamma)$ if, and only if, $Q \in \pi_n(I_\gamma)$, and*
(f) *$P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_{\le n}(O_\gamma)$ for all $P \in \pi_{\le n}(\overline{O}_\gamma)$ if, and only if, $Q \in \pi_{\le n}(O_\gamma)$.*

Note how in the case $\gamma = 0$ this theorem implies the disk-cases of Grace's theorem, while for $\gamma \to 1$ we obtain certain half-plane cases of Grace's theorem (most notably Corollary 19).

In [12, 13, 14] convolution invariance results concerning certain classes of functions which are analytic on the sets Ω_τ and I_γ are obtained by resorting to a limiting case of Suffridge's theorem (i.e. Theorem 5) which deals with the convolution of starlike and convex univalent mappings on $\mathbb{D}$. It is therefore natural to ask whether there is some kind of extension of Theorem 5 from which the results in [12, 13, 14] can be obtained as limiting cases.

Problem 3. Find Suffridge-like extensions of the statements in Theorem 20.

As noted above, Borcea and Brändén [2] found a complete characterization of all linear operators on the space of complex polynomials which preserve the sets $\pi_n(\Omega)$ and $\pi_n(\partial\Omega)$ for disks or half-planes Ω. Theorem 20 naturally leads to the question for the linear preservers of $\pi_n(\overline{O}_\gamma)$ and $\pi_n(\overline{I}_\gamma)$ for $\gamma \in (0,1]$. Because of (24) this includes the problem, posed in [2], to classify all linear preservers of $\pi_n(\Omega)$ when Ω is a ray or a finite interval.

Theorem 20 is essentially only a corollary of Borcea's and Brändén's results from [2]. Nevertheless in Section 3 we will give a short self-contained proof which uses only the original Grace-Szegö convolution theorem.

2. Preliminaries

Before we can proceed to the proofs of the main results, we need to mention certain facts regarding n-inverses and n-self-inversive polynomials (many of them are fairly obvious, some of them are explained in more detail in [17, Sec. 7.1]).

Recall that above, for a polynomial $P(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k z^k$ of degree $\le n$, we defined

$$P^{*n}(z) := z^n \overline{P\left(\frac{1}{\overline{z}}\right)} = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \overline{a}_{n-k} z^k$$

and called P^{*n} the *n-inverse* of P. The zeros of P^{*n} are the zeros of P reflected with respect to $\mathbb{T}$ (if we consider a polynomial P of degree $m < n$ as a polynomial with a zero of order $n-m$ at ∞), and the mapping $P \mapsto P^{*n}$ has the following properties (in order to verify the last one, note that, by (7), one has $C_{n-k}^{(n)}(\lambda) = C_k^{(n)}(\lambda) \in \mathbb{R}$ for $k = 0, \dots, n$):

$$\begin{aligned} (aP+bQ)^{*n} &= \overline{a}P^{*n} + \overline{b}Q^{*n} \quad \text{for all} \quad a,b \in \mathbb{C},\ P,Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C}), \\ (P(cz))^{*n} &= \overline{c}^n P^{*n}(cz) \quad \text{for all} \quad c \in \mathbb{T},\ P \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C}), \\ (P *_\lambda Q)^{*n} &= P^{*n} *_\lambda Q^{*n} \quad \text{for all} \quad \lambda \in [0, 2\pi/n),\ P,Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C}). \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

A polynomial P of degree $\le n$ is called *n-self-inversive* if $P = P^{*n}$, and every such polynomial belongs to the set $\mathcal{ST}_n$ of polynomials of degree $\le n$ whose zeros lie symmetrically around $\mathbb{T}$. Conversely, for every $P \in \mathcal{ST}_n$ there is a uniquely determined $c_P \in \{e^{it} : t \in [0,\pi)\}$ such that $c_P P$ belongs to $\mathcal{SI}_n$. It follows that if $P \in \mathcal{ST}_n$, then

$$e^{-int/2} c_P P(e^{it}) \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{26}$$

and thus that

$$\operatorname{Re} \frac{e^{it}P'(e^{it})}{P(e^{it})} = \frac{n}{2} \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \mathbb{R} \quad \text{with} \quad P(e^{it}) \neq 0.$$

In particular,

$$\text{if} \quad P \in \mathcal{ST}_n \quad \text{then every critical point of } P \text{ on } \mathbb{T} \text{ is a multiple zero of } P. \tag{27}$$

If P and Q belong to $\pi_n(\mathbb{T})$, then we say that P and Q have *interspersed zeros* and write $P \curlyvee Q$ if the zeros of P and Q alternate on $\mathbb{T}$. If $P \curlyvee Q$ and P and Q are co-prime, then we write $P \succ Q$ and say that P and Q have *strictly interspersed zeros*.

The following connection between interspersion and zero separation is proven in [7, Lem. 21] (cf. (10) for the definition of P_+ and P_-).

Lemma 21. *Suppose all zeros of P lie on $\mathbb{T}$ and let $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n}]$. Then $P \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, $P_+ \curlyvee P_-$. Furthermore, $P \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, $P_+ \succ P_-$.*

Two characterizations of interspersion will be useful in the following.

Lemma 22. *Suppose $P, Q \in \mathcal{ST}_n$ are such that $P/Q \not\equiv \text{const}$ and set $F := P - Q$.*

(a) *(Hermite-Biehler) If $c_P \neq c_Q$, then $P \curlyvee Q$ if, and only if, F or F^{*n} belongs to $\pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$. $P \succ Q$ holds if, and only if, either F or F^{*n} belongs to $\pi_n(\mathbb{D})$.*

(b) *(Hermite-Kakeya) If $c_P = c_Q$, then P and Q have interspersed zeros if, and only if,*

$$P - xQ \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(0) \quad \textit{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{28}$$

P and Q have strictly interspersed zeros if, and only if, $Q \in \mathcal{T}_n(0)$ and

$$P - xQ \in \mathcal{T}_n(0) \quad \textit{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{29}$$

Proof. Statement (a) and the 'only if' direction of (b) were shown in [7, Thm. 18].

If (28) holds, then $R(z) := P(z)/Q(z)$ is not constant (by hypothesis) and takes real values if, and only if, $z \in \mathbb{T}$. R therefore maps $\mathbb{D}$ either onto the upper or lower half-plane. Hence, all zeros of $P - iQ$ lie either in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ or in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$. Since $c_{iQ} = \pm i c_Q \neq c_P$, it follows from (a) that P and iQ have interspersed zeros.

If $Q \in \mathcal{T}_n(0)$ and $P \curlywedge Q$ with a common zero $w = e^{it_0}$, then

$$P - xQ = (z - w)(\hat{P} - x\hat{Q}) \tag{30}$$

where $\hat{P} := P/(z-w)$, $\hat{Q} := Q/(z-w)$ and $\hat{Q}(w) \neq 0$. Since for

$$x_0 = \frac{\hat{P}(w)}{\hat{Q}(w)} = \lim_{t \to t_0} \frac{e^{-int/2} c_P P(e^{it})}{e^{-int/2} c_Q Q(e^{it})}$$

we have $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, by (26), and $\hat{P}(w) - x_0 \hat{Q}(w) = 0$, it follows from (30) that $P - x_0 Q$ has a double zero at w. □

Observe that the Hermite-Biehler theorem and Lemma 21 directly imply Theorem 9.

3. Proofs

Proof of Theorem 9. The proofs of (16) and (17) are very similar, and therefore we will only verify (16).

Note first that F must have at least one zero in $\mathbb{D}$: if $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$, then this is clear; if $F + \zeta F^{*n} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, then this follows from (19). Consequently, (11) is equivalent to the fact that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$G_x := e^{-in\lambda/4} F_+ - x e^{in\lambda/4} F_- \in \pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \quad \text{with at least one zero in } \mathbb{D}, \tag{31}$$

i.e. to the fact that

$$G_x / G_x^{*n} \quad \text{is a Blaschke product of degree } m = 1, \dots, n \text{ for all } x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{32}$$

Since $F \in \pi_n(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ with at least one zero in $\mathbb{D}$, F/F^{*n} is a Blaschke product of positive degree, and thus (use (25) to calculate $G_x^{*n}(0)$)

$$|(G_x/G_x^{*n})(0)| = |(F/F^{*n})(0)| < 1. \tag{33}$$

Hence, (32) holds if, and only if, ((33) is needed for the 'if'-direction)

$$G_x + \zeta G_x^{*n} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(0) \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{R},\ \zeta \in \mathbb{T}. \tag{34}$$

Using (25), we obtain

$$G_x + \zeta G_x^{*n} = e^{-in\lambda/4} \left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_+ - x e^{in\lambda/4} \left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_- .$$

It thus follows from the Hermite-Kakeya theorem that (34) is equivalent to

$$\left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_+ \curlywedge \left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_- \quad \text{for all} \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Because of Lemma 21 this is true if, and only if, $F + \zeta F^{*n} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$.

If $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ and $e^{-in\lambda/2}F_+(z_0)/F_-(z_0) = x_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ for a $z_0 \in \mathbb{T}$, then we have $G_{x_0}(z_0) = G_{x_0}^{*n}(z_0) = 0$, where G_x is defined as in (31). From our considerations above it then follows that

$$G_{x_0}(z_0) + \zeta G_{x_0}^{*n}(z_0) = e^{-in\lambda/4}\left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_+(z_0) - x_0 e^{in\lambda/4}\left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_-(z_0) = 0$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$. Hence,

$$e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{\left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_+(z_0)}{\left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_-(z_0)} = x_0,$$

for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ except for those finitely many $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ for which $\left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_-(z_0) = 0$. However, if ζ_0 is one of these ζ, then

$$\lim_{z\to z_0} e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{\left(F + \zeta_0 F^{*n}\right)_+(z)}{\left(F + \zeta_0 F^{*n}\right)_-(z)} = \lim_{\zeta\to\zeta_0} e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{\left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_+(z_0)}{\left(F + \zeta F^{*n}\right)_-(z_0)} = x_0.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 8. For $\lambda = \frac{2\pi}{n}$ the assertion follows directly from the definition of the class $\overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\frac{2\pi}{n})$. If $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ and $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$, then $F + \zeta F^{*n} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda) \subset \mathcal{T}_n(0)$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ by Theorem 9, and thus $F \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ by (15). □

Proof of Theorem 7a. The case $\lambda = 0$ is Corollary 3 and thus it suffices to consider only the case $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$.

If $F *_\lambda G \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ for all $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$, then choosing $F = Q_n(\lambda; z)$ yields $G \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$.

In order to prove the other direction, we can suppose that we do not have simultaneously $F \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ and $G \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, since in this case the assertion follows directly from Suffridge's convolution theorem.

Suppose now that $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ and $G \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$. Then, by Theorem 9, $P := G + \zeta e^{it} G^{*n} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ for all except at most one $t \in [0, 2\pi)$ (such an exceptional t exists if, and only if, $G \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ and for this t we have $P \equiv 0$) and $F + \eta F^{*n} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ for all $\eta \in \mathbb{T}$. Hence, by Suffridge's convolution theorem,

$$P *_\lambda \left(F + \eta F^{*n}\right) = P *_\lambda F + \eta \overline{c}_P^2 (P *_\lambda F)^{*n} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$$

for all $\eta \in \mathbb{T}$ and thus

$$P *_\lambda F = (G + \zeta e^{it} G^{*n}) *_\lambda F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \tag{35}$$

by Theorem 9. If $G \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, then $G + \zeta e^{it} G^{*n} = (1 + \zeta e^{it} c_G^2) G$, and hence in the case $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ and $G \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ the assertion follows directly from (35). The case $F \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ and $G \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ can be proven in a similar way, and therefore it only remains to verify the assertion when $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ and $G \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$.

Choose such F and G and note that, because of Lemma 8, all zeros of F and G must lie in $\mathbb{D}$. Moreover, F and G must satisfy (35) and thus, by definition, for all $t, x \in \mathbb{R}$ all solutions of

$$e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{\left((G + \zeta e^{it} G^{*n}) *_\lambda F\right)_+}{\left((G + \zeta e^{it} G^{*n}) *_\lambda F\right)_-} = x$$

lie in $\mathbb{D}$. Hence, for all $t, x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$B_t(z) := \left(e^{-in\lambda/4} F_+ - x e^{in\lambda/4} F_-\right) *_\lambda \left(G + \zeta e^{it} G^{*n}\right) \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D}). \tag{36}$$

Consequently, B_t / B_t^{*n} is a Blaschke product of degree n which implies that

$$A_{s,t} := e^{is} B_t - \zeta e^{it} B_t^{*n} \in \mathcal{T}_n(0) \quad \text{for all} \quad s, t \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{37}$$

and that the zeros of $A_{s,t}(z)$ are continuous and arg-decreasing with respect to s. On the other hand, using the relations (10), (25), and the fact that the operation $*_\lambda$ is associative, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{s,t} &= e^{is}(e^{-in\lambda/4}F_+ - xe^{in\lambda/4}F_-) *_\lambda (G + \zeta e^{it}G^{*n}) - \\
&\quad - \zeta e^{it}\left[(e^{-in\lambda/4}F_+ - xe^{in\lambda/4}F_-) *_\lambda (G + \zeta e^{it}G^{*n})\right]^{*n} \\
&= e^{is}e^{-in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G)_+ + \zeta e^{i(s+t)}e^{-in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G^{*n})_+ - \\
&\quad - xe^{is}e^{in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G)_- - x\zeta e^{i(s+t)}e^{in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G^{*n})_- \\
&\quad - \zeta e^{it}\left[e^{-in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G)_+ + \zeta e^{it}e^{-in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G^{*n})_+ - \right. \\
&\quad \left. -xe^{in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G)_- - x\zeta e^{it}e^{in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G^{*n})_-\right]^{*n} \\
&= e^{is}e^{-in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G)_+ + \zeta e^{i(s+t)}e^{-in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G^{*n})_+ - \\
&\quad - xe^{is}e^{in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G)_- - x\zeta e^{i(s+t)}e^{in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G^{*n})_- \\
&\quad - \zeta e^{it}e^{-in\lambda/4}(F^{*n} *_\lambda G^{*n})_+ - e^{-in\lambda/4}(F^{*n} *_\lambda G)_+ + \\
&\quad + x\zeta e^{it}e^{in\lambda/4}(F^{*n} *_\lambda G^{*n})_- + xe^{in\lambda/4}(F^{*n} *_\lambda G)_- \quad ,
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

which shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\zeta}e^{-i(s+t)}A_{s,t} &= \overline{\zeta}e^{-it}e^{-in\lambda/4}F *_\lambda G_+ + e^{-in\lambda/4}F *_\lambda (G^{*n})_+ - \\
&\quad - x\overline{\zeta}e^{-it}e^{in\lambda/4}F *_\lambda G_- - xe^{in\lambda/4}F *_\lambda (G^{*n})_- \\
&\quad - e^{-is}e^{-in\lambda/4}F^{*n} *_\lambda (G^{*n})_+ - e^{-i(s+t)}\overline{\zeta}e^{-in\lambda/4}F^{*n} *_\lambda G_+ + \\
&\quad + xe^{-is}e^{in\lambda/4}F^{*n} *_\lambda (G^{*n})_- + xe^{-i(s+t)}\overline{\zeta}e^{in\lambda/4}F^{*n} *_\lambda G_- \\
&= \overline{\zeta}e^{-it}(F - e^{-is}F^{*n}) *_\lambda (e^{-in\lambda/4}G_+ - xe^{in\lambda/4}G_-) + \\
&\quad + (F - e^{-is}F^{*n}) *_\lambda (e^{-in\lambda/4}(G^{*n})_+ - xe^{in\lambda/4}(G^{*n})_-) \\
&= \overline{\zeta}e^{-it}(F - e^{-is}F^{*n}) *_\lambda (e^{-in\lambda/4}G_+ - xe^{in\lambda/4}G_-) - \\
&\quad - e^{-is}\left[(F - e^{-is}F^{*n}) *_\lambda (e^{-in\lambda/4}G_+ - xe^{in\lambda/4}G_-)\right]^{*n} \\
&= \overline{\zeta}e^{-it}C_s - e^{-is}C_s^{*n},
\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where

$$C_s := (F - e^{-is}F^{*n}) *_\lambda (e^{-in\lambda/4}G_+ - xe^{in\lambda/4}G_-).$$

Exchanging the roles of F and G in the arguments that were used to deduce (36) shows that $C_s \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ for all $s, x \in \mathbb{R}$. Consequently, (39) implies that the zeros of $A_{s,t}(z)$ are continuous and arg-increasing with respect to t.

We have thus shown that all zeros of $A_{0,0}$ lie on $\mathbb{T}$ and are simple and that, for s increasing from 0, the zeros of $A_{s,0}$ arg-decrease, while those of $A_{0,s}$ arg-increase. It follows that for $s > 0$, but s close to 0, we have $A_{s,0} \curlyvee A_{0,s}$. Therefore, by the Hermite-Kakeya theorem,

$$A_{s,0} - A_{0,s} \in \mathcal{T}_n(0), \tag{40}$$

since it follows readily from (37) that $c_{A_{s,0}} = c_{A_{0,s}}$. Using (38), we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{A_{s,0} - A_{0,s}}{e^{is} - 1} &= e^{-in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G + \zeta(F *_\lambda G)^{*n})_+ - \\
&\quad - xe^{in\lambda/4}(F *_\lambda G + \zeta(F *_\lambda G)^{*n})_- \in \mathcal{T}_n(0)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. The Hermite-Kakeya theorem therefore implies

$$(F *_\lambda G + \zeta(F *_\lambda G)^{*n})_+ \vee (F *_\lambda G + \zeta(F *_\lambda G)^{*n})_-.$$

Hence, by Lemma 21, $F *_\lambda G + \zeta(F *_\lambda G)^{*n} \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, and thus $F *_\lambda G \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$ by Theorem 9. □

Proof of Theorem 7b. Note that Theorem 5b is equivalent to the statement that for $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ and $\mu \in (\lambda, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ one has

$$P *_\lambda Q_n(\mu; z) \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mu) \quad \text{for all} \quad P \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda) \quad \text{which are not } \lambda\text{-extremal.}$$

Hence, in order to prove the assertion, it only remains to show that

$$F *_\lambda Q_n(\mu; z) \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mu) \tag{41}$$

for all $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ for which $F + \zeta F^{*n}$ is not λ-extremal for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$.

Now, for such F it follows from Theorem 9 that $F + \zeta F^{*n} \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$. Since $F + \zeta F^{*n}$ is not λ-extremal for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, Theorem 5b yields,

$$F *_\lambda Q_n(\mu; z) + \zeta(F *_\lambda Q_n(\mu; z))^{*n} = (F + \zeta F^{*n}) *_\lambda Q_n(\mu; z) \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mu)$$

for all $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, which implies (41) by Theorem 9. □

Proof of Theorem 7c. Suppose first that there is a $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ such that $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k z^k \in \mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{PT}_n(\lambda)$ and set

$$F_\mu(z) := \sum_{k=0}^n C_k^{(n)}(\mu) a_k z^k \quad \text{for} \quad \mu \in [\lambda, \frac{2\pi}{n}). \tag{42}$$

Then $F_\mu \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mu) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in [\lambda, \frac{2\pi}{n})$, by Theorem 7b. Hence, by definition of the classes $\mathcal{D}_n(\mu)$,

$$\operatorname{Im} e^{-in\mu/2} \left(\frac{F_\mu(e^{i\mu/2} z)}{F_\mu(e^{-i\mu/2} z)} - 1 \right) > \sin \frac{n\mu}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D},\ \mu \in [\lambda, \tfrac{2\pi}{n}).$$

This is equivalent to

$$\operatorname{Re} e^{-in\mu/2} \frac{z\Delta_\mu^n[F_\mu](z)}{F_\mu(e^{-i\mu/2} z)} > \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D},\ \mu \in [\lambda, \tfrac{2\pi}{n}). \tag{43}$$

Now,

$$z\Delta_\mu^n[F_\mu] = \sum_{k=1}^n C_{k-1}^{(n-1)}(\mu) a_k z^k, \tag{44}$$

and it follows from the definition of $Q_n(\lambda; z)$ that

$$Q_{n-1}(\tfrac{2\pi}{n}; z) = \frac{1 - z^n}{1 - z} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} z^k \qquad \text{and} \qquad Q_n(\tfrac{2\pi}{n}; z) = 1 + z^n.$$

Hence,

$$C_k^{(n-1)}(\tfrac{2\pi}{n}) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad C_k^{(n)}(\tfrac{2\pi}{n}) = 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad k = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

and therefore it follows from (42) and (44) that

$$z\Delta_\mu^n[F_\mu] \to f(z) - a_0 \quad \text{and} \quad F_\mu(e^{-i\mu/2} z) \to -a_n z^n + a_0 \quad \text{as} \quad \mu \to \frac{2\pi}{n}.$$

Because of (43), this implies

$$\operatorname{Re} \frac{f(z) - a_0}{a_n z^n - a_0} > \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}. \tag{45}$$

In order to show that (45) must also hold for $z \in \mathbb{T}$, note that $\mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{PT}_n(\lambda)$ is open (if we identify $\mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{PT}_n(\lambda)$ with a subset of $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ via the mapping $\sum_{k=0}^n a_k z^k \mapsto (a_0, \dots, a_n)$). Hence, if there is a $f \in \mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{PT}_n(\lambda)$ for which there is a $z_1 \in \mathbb{T}$ such that

$$\operatorname{Re} \frac{f(z_1) - a_0}{a_n z_1^n - a_0} = \frac{1}{2},$$

then by slightly changing the cofficient a_1 (to a_1^*, say) we can obtain a polynomial $g(z) = a_0 + a_1^* z + \sum_{k=2}^n a_k z^k \in \mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{PT}_n(\lambda)$ for which

$$\operatorname{Re} \frac{g(z_1) - a_0}{a_n z_1^n - a_0} < \frac{1}{2},$$

and which therefore, by (45) and Theorem 5c, cannot belong to $\mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda)$. This contradiction shows that if $f \in \mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{PT}_n(\lambda)$ for a $\lambda \in [0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$, then we have

$$\operatorname{Re} \frac{f(z) - a_0}{a_n z^n - a_0} > \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}, \tag{46}$$

as required.

Suppose on the other hand that $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k z^k$ with $|a_0| < |a_n|$ satisfies (46). Then, since $|a_0/a_n| < 1$, all zeros of $a_n z^n - a_0$ lie in $\mathbb{D}$, and thus, by continuity, there must be a $\mu \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ for which (43) holds. As shown above this is equivalent to $F_\mu \in \mathcal{D}_n(\mu)$ and hence to $f \in \mathcal{PD}_n(\mu)$. □

Proof of Theorem 11. As shown in the proof of Theorem 7c (cf. (43)) if $F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda)$, then

$$\operatorname{Re} e^{-in\lambda/2} \frac{z\Delta_\lambda^n[F](z)}{F(e^{-i\lambda/2}z)} > \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}.$$

Hence, for such F the polynomial $\Delta_\lambda^n[F]$ cannot vanish in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$ and thus all its zeros must lie in $\mathbb{D}$. The proof of the case $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ is similar. □

Proof of Theorem 13. We will only prove the case $F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$, the case $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ being similar.

Let P, $Q \in \pi_n(\mathbb{T})$ with $c_P =: e^{it_P} \neq c_Q =: e^{it_Q}$ and suppose that $F = P - Q \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$. By Theorem 9 this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-it}F + e^{it}F^{*n} &= e^{-it}(P - Q) + e^{it}(c_P^2 P - c_Q^2 Q) \\ &= 2\left[\cos(t + t_P)c_P P - \cos(t + t_Q)c_Q Q\right] \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Since $e^{it_P} \neq e^{it_Q}$, the real function $\cos(t + t_Q)/\cos(t + t_P)$ takes every real value exactly once when t traverses any interval of length 2π, and thus the above relation is equivalent to

$$Q \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad c_P P - r c_Q Q \in \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda) \quad \text{for all} \quad r \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{47}$$

By Theorem 10 this holds if, and only if,

$$\Delta_\lambda^n[Q] \in \pi_{n-1}(\mathbb{D}) \quad \text{and} \quad c_P \Delta_\lambda^n[P] - r c_Q \Delta_\lambda^n[Q] \in \pi_{n-1}(\mathbb{D}) \quad \text{for all} \quad r \in \mathbb{R}.$$

This is true if, and only if, $R := c_P \overline{c}_Q \Delta_\lambda^n[P]/\Delta_\lambda^n[Q]$ takes no real values in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$, i.e. if, and only if, R maps $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$ into either the upper or lower half-plane. □

Proof of Theorem 14. Note first that if $F = P - Q$ with $P, Q \in \mathcal{ST}_n$ and $c_P \neq c_Q$, then a straightforward calculation using (18) shows that $T = (c_P^2 - c_Q^2)S$ and hence it suffices to consider only the polynomial T.

By definition and the maximum principle if $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$, then

$$I(z) := \operatorname{Im} e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{F_+(z)}{F_-(z)} \geq 0,$$

or

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{i}\left(e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{F_+}{F_-} - e^{in\lambda/2}\frac{\overline{F}_+}{\overline{F}_-}\right) = \frac{-i\left(F_+ \cdot (F^{*n})_- - F_- \cdot (F^{*n})_+\right)}{e^{in\lambda/2}F_- \cdot (F^{*n})_-}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$. It is easy to check that the numerator and denominator of the rational function on the right-hand side of this expression are $2n$-self-inversive polynomials, and thus the above inequality is equivalent to

$$0 \leq \frac{N(t)}{D(t)} \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$N(t) := -ie^{-int}T(e^{it})$$

and

$$D(t) := e^{-int}e^{in\lambda/2}F_-(e^{it}) \cdot (F^{*n})_-(e^{it}) = \left|F_-(e^{it})\right|^2$$

are real functions by (26).

If $F \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda) \setminus \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$, then $D(t) > 0$ by Theorem 8, which proves (b).

If, on the other hand, $F \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ and all zeros of T on $\mathbb{T}$ are of even order, then either $N(t)/D(t) \geq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, or $N(t)/D(t) \leq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, which implies that we have either $I(z) \geq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$, or $I(z) \leq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{T}$. Since $F \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$, the function I is harmonic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$ with $I(\infty) = \sin(n\lambda/2) > 0$. The maximum principle therefore shows that $I(z) \geq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{D}$. This proves (a).

By what we have shown so far it is clear that for a $F \in \pi_n(\mathbb{D})$ we have $F \in \mathcal{D}_n(\lambda) \setminus \mathcal{T}_n(\lambda)$ if, and only if, $N(t) > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. if, and only if, the $2n$-self-inversive polynomial T does not vanish on $\mathbb{T}$. By [17, Thm. 7.1.3] this holds if, and only if, T has exactly $n-1$ critical points in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. In fact, if T has no zeros on $\mathbb{T}$, then T cannot have any critical points on $\mathbb{T}$ by (27). The proof of the theorem is thus complete. □

Proof of Theorem 15. Suppose first that $A \in \pi_n(\mathbb{T})$ with $c_A \neq 1$ is such that $F(z) := A(z) - Q_n(\lambda; z) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$. Then, $A \in \overline{\mathcal{T}}_n(\lambda)$ by Lemma 12, and since

$$Q_n(\lambda; -e^{i(2j-n\pm1)\lambda/2}) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad j \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\},$$

we have that

$$e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{F_+\left(-e^{i(2j-n)\lambda/2}\right)}{F_-\left(-e^{i(2j-n)\lambda/2}\right)} = e^{-in\lambda/2}\frac{A_+\left(-e^{i(2j-n)\lambda/2}\right)}{A_-\left(-e^{i(2j-n)\lambda/2}\right)}$$

is real by Lemma 6. Since

$$\lim_{z \to -e^{i(2j-n)\lambda/2}} \frac{(Q_n)_+(\lambda; z)}{(Q_n)_-(\lambda; z)} = \lim_{z \to -e^{i(2j-n)\lambda/2}} \frac{1 + e^{in\lambda/2}z}{1 + e^{-in\lambda/2}z} = e^{in\lambda/2}\frac{\sin\frac{j\lambda}{2}}{\sin\frac{(j-n)\lambda}{2}},$$

it follows from Theorem 9 and (21) that

$$A\left(-e^{i(2j-n+1)\lambda/2}\right) = e^{in\lambda/2}\frac{\sin\frac{j\lambda}{2}}{\sin\frac{(j-n)\lambda}{2}}A\left(-e^{i(2j-n-1)\lambda/2}\right)$$

for all $j \in \{1,\dots,n-1\}$, where $A(-e^{i(2j-n-1)\lambda/2}) \neq 0$ since $A \vee Q_n(\lambda;z)$ by Lemma 12. Hence, if we set $\hat{a} := (-i)^n e^{in(n-1)\lambda/4} c_A A(-e^{-i(n-1)\lambda/2})$, then $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ by (26) and

$$A(-e^{i(2k-n-1)\lambda/2}) = \hat{a}\overline{c}_A i^n e^{in(2k-n-1)\lambda/4} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\sin\frac{j\lambda}{2}}{\sin\frac{(j-n)\lambda}{2}} \tag{48}$$

for $k \in \{1,\dots,n\}$. Moreover, $\hat{b} := (-i)^n e^{in(n+1)\lambda/4} c_A A(-e^{-i(n+1)\lambda/2}) \in \mathbb{R}$ and thus

$$A\left(-e^{-i(n+1)\lambda/2}\right) = \hat{b}\overline{c}_A i^n e^{-in(n+1)\lambda/4}. \tag{49}$$

Now, suppose P is as in (23) with

$$c = \overline{c}_A, \quad a = \frac{\hat{a}}{2^n \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \sin\frac{j\lambda}{2}}, \quad b = \frac{\hat{b}}{(-2)^n \prod_{j=1}^{n} \sin\frac{(j-n-1)\lambda}{2}}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(-e^{-i(n+1)\lambda/2}\right) &= bcQ_n\left(\lambda; -e^{-i(n+1)\lambda/2}\right) = bc\prod_{j=1}^{n}\left(1-e^{i(j-n-1)\lambda}\right) \\ &= bc(-2)^n i^n e^{-in(n+1)\lambda/4} \prod_{j=1}^{n} \sin\frac{(j-n-1)\lambda}{2} \\ &= \hat{b}\overline{c}_A i^n e^{-in(n+1)\lambda/4}. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Moreover, since

$$\lim_{z\to -e^{i(2k-n-1)\lambda/2}} \frac{Q_n(\lambda;z)}{1+e^{i(2l-n-1)\lambda/2}z} = \begin{cases} \prod\limits_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq n+1-k}}^{n} (1-e^{i(j+k-n-1)\lambda}) & \text{if} \quad l = n+1-k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we have, for $k \in \{1,\dots,n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} P(-e^{i(2k-n-1)\lambda/2}) &= 2iac \prod_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq n+1-k}}^{n} (1-e^{i(j+k-n-1)\lambda}) \\ &= 2(-2)^{n-1} aci^n e^{in(2k-n-1)\lambda/4} \prod_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq n+1-k}}^{n} \sin\frac{(j+k-n-1)\lambda}{2} \\ &= 2(-2)^{n-1} aci^n e^{in(2k-n-1)\lambda/4} \prod_{j=1}^{n-k}\left(-\sin\frac{j\lambda}{2}\right)\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\sin\frac{j\lambda}{2} \\ &= 2^n aci^n e^{in(2k-n-1)\lambda/4} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\sin\frac{j\lambda}{2}}{\sin\frac{(j-n)\lambda}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\sin\frac{j\lambda}{2} \\ &= \hat{a}\overline{c}_A i^n e^{in(2k-n-1)\lambda/4} \prod_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{\sin\frac{j\lambda}{2}}{\sin\frac{(j-n)\lambda}{2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Relations (48)–(51) prove that $A = P$.

Now suppose that there are $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $c \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{\pm 1\}$ such that P is as in (23). We will prove that in this case $F(z) := P(z) - Q_n(\lambda;z) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}_n(\lambda)$ by employing Theorem 13 and showing that

$$\frac{\overline{c}\Delta_\lambda^n[P]}{\Delta_\lambda^n[Q_n(\lambda;z)]} = \frac{\overline{c}\Delta_\lambda^n[P]}{Q_{n-1}(\lambda;z)}$$

maps $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ into the upper or lower halfplane. To that end, we write

$$H_k(z) = \frac{e^{i(k-n-1)\frac{\lambda}{2}}}{\sin\frac{(k-n-1)\lambda}{2}} \frac{1+e^{i(n+1)\frac{\lambda}{2}}z}{1+e^{i(2k-n-1)\frac{\lambda}{2}}z},$$

which means that

$$\overline{c}P(z) = bQ_n(\lambda;z) + a\sum_{k=1}^{n} H_k(z)Q_n(\lambda;z).$$

It is easy to check that for two rational functions f and g

$$\Delta_\lambda^n[f\,g] = \Delta_\lambda^n[f]\,g_+ + f_-\,\Delta_\lambda^n[g].$$

Hence, since $Q_n(\lambda;e^{i\lambda/2}z)/Q_{n-1}(\lambda;z) = 1+e^{in\lambda/2}z$ (cf. (3)),

$$\frac{\overline{c}\Delta_\lambda^n[P]}{Q_{n-1}(\lambda;z)} = b + a\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left((1+e^{in\lambda/2}z)\Delta_\lambda^n[H_k] + H_k(e^{-i\lambda/2}z)\right).$$

Straightforward computations show

$$(1+e^{in\lambda/2}z)\Delta_\lambda^n[H_k] + H_k(e^{-i\lambda/2}z) = \frac{e^{-i(k-n-1)\lambda/2}}{\sin\frac{(k-n-1)\lambda}{2}} + \frac{2i}{\sin\frac{n\lambda}{2}}\left(\frac{e^{ik\lambda/2}\sin\frac{(n-k)\lambda}{2}}{1+e^{i(2k-n)\lambda/2}z} + \frac{e^{i(k-n-1)\lambda/2}\sin\frac{(k-1)\lambda}{2}}{1+e^{i(2(k-1)-n)\lambda/2}z}\right),$$

and hence

$$\frac{\overline{c}\Delta_\lambda^n[P]}{Q_{n-1}(\lambda;z)} = b + a\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{e^{-i(k-n)\lambda/2}}{\sin\frac{(k-n)\lambda}{2}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\frac{2i}{1+e^{i(2k-n)\lambda/2}z}\right).$$

The rational function $2i/(1+z)$ maps $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}$ onto $\{z\in\mathbb{C}:\operatorname{Im} z\le 1\}$ and thus we find that

$$\operatorname{Im}\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\frac{e^{-i(k-n)\lambda/2}}{\sin\frac{(k-n)\lambda}{2}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\frac{2i}{1+e^{i(2k-n)\lambda/2}z}\right) \le -1$$

for $z\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}$. Depending on the sign of a, $\overline{c}\Delta_\lambda^n[P]/Q_{n-1}(\lambda;z)$ therefore maps $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}$ into the lower or upper half-plane. □

Proof of Theorem 16. Suppose $p(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k z^k$ belongs to $\mathcal{PD}_n(\lambda)$ for a $\lambda \in (0, \frac{2\pi}{n})$ and satisfies $p^{*n}(0) = 1$. Since $p^{*n}(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n}\overline{a}_{n-k}z^k$, this means $a_n = 1$, and thus it follows from Theorem 7c that

$$\operatorname{Re}\frac{p(z)-a_0}{z^n-a_0} > \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{for} \quad z\in\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{D}.$$

This implies

$$\operatorname{Re}\frac{\overline{p(\frac{1}{z})}-\overline{a}_0}{\frac{1}{z^n}-\overline{a}_0} = \operatorname{Re}\frac{p^{*n}(z)-\overline{a}_0 z^n}{1-\overline{a}_0 z^n} > \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{for} \quad z\in\overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Hence, if a function f is the limit of such polynomials p^{*n} (uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{D}$), then $\operatorname{Re} f(z) > \frac{1}{2}$ for all $z\in\mathbb{D}$. □

Proof of Theorem 17. We will only prove the 'only if'-direction, since the other direction is clear. Hence, suppose that $f(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k z^k$ is analytic in $\mathbb{D}$ with

$f(0) = 1$ and $\operatorname{Re} f(z) > 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{D}$. Choose an increasing sequence $(r_n)_n \subset (0,1)$ with $\lim_{n\to\infty} r_n = 1$ and set, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$S_n(z) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k z^k.$$

Next, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, choose $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k_n > k_{n-1}$ (where $k_0 = 0$) such that

$$\operatorname{Re} S_{k_n}(r_n z) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |f(r_n z) - S_{k_n}(r_n z)| < \frac{1}{n} \quad \text{for all} \quad z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}. \tag{52}$$

Then, clearly, $f(z) = \lim_{n\to\infty} S_{k_n}(r_n z)$, and thus also

$$f(z) = \lim_{n\to\infty} S_{k_n}(r_n z) + z^{k_n}(S_{k_n}(r_n z))^{*k_n} \tag{53}$$

uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathbb{D}$, since by the maximum principle

$$\left|z^{k_n}(S_{k_n}(r_n z))^{*k_n}\right| = \left|z^{2k_n}\overline{S}_{k_n}(r_n \overline{z}^{-1})\right| < \left|z^{k_n-1}S_{k_n}(r_n z)\right|, \qquad z \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Set

$$P(z) = S_{k_n}(r_n z) + z^{k_n}(S_{k_n}(r_n z))^{*k_n}. \tag{54}$$

Then P is of degree $m := m_n := 2k_n$ and

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-imt/2}P(e^{it}) &= e^{-ik_n t}(S_{k_n}(r_n e^{it}) + e^{ik_n t}(S_{k_n}(r_n e^{it}))^{*k_n}) \\ &= e^{-ik_n t}S_{k_n}(r_n e^{it}) + e^{ik_n t}\overline{S_{k_n}(r_n e^{it})} \\ &= 2\operatorname{Re} e^{-imt/2}S_{k_n}(r_n e^{it}) \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, with $t_k = \frac{2k\pi}{m}$,

$$(-1)^k P(e^{it_k}) = e^{-imt_k}P(e^{it_k}) = 2(-1)^k \operatorname{Re} S_{k_n}(r_n e^{it_k}),$$

and hence, because of (52),

$$P(e^{2k\pi i/m}) > 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad k = 1, \dots, m.$$

The partial fraction expansion

$$\frac{P(z)}{1-z^m} = -1 + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{P(e^{2k\pi i/m})}{m(1 - e^{2k\pi i/m}z)},$$

shows that $\sum_{k=1}^{m} P(e^{2k\pi i/m}) = 2m$. This, in turn leads to,

$$\frac{P(z)}{1-z^m} = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{P(e^{2k\pi i/m})}{2m}\left(\frac{2}{1 - e^{2k\pi i/m}z} - 1\right) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} s_k^{(n)} \frac{1 + e^{2k\pi i/m}z}{1 - e^{2k\pi i/m}z}, \tag{55}$$

where $s_k^{(n)} := \frac{P(e^{2k\pi i/m})}{2m} > 0$ for all $k = 1, \dots, m$ and $s_1^{(n)} + \ldots + s_{2m}^{(n)} = 1$. The assertion now follows from (53)–(55). □

Proof of Theorem 20. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, $\gamma \in [0,1)$. We start with the proof of (a) and thus consider a polynomial $P \in \pi_n(\overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma})$ and a polynomial $Q \in \pi_n(I_\gamma)$. Then, $\beta \in I_\gamma$ for every zero β of Q, which means

$$\gamma|1 + \beta| < 1 - |\beta|. \tag{56}$$

This holds if, and only if,

$$|\beta| < |1 + \gamma z\,(1 + \beta)| \quad \text{for} \quad z \in \mathbb{T},$$

and hence, by the maximum principle (note that $1/(\gamma|1+\beta|) > 1/(1-|\beta|) > 1$ by (56)), if, and only if,

$$\omega(z) = \frac{-\beta z}{1+\gamma z(1+\beta)}$$

maps $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ into $\mathbb{D}$. Since

$$-\beta\, w_{\tau,\gamma}(z) = \frac{-\beta\tau z}{1+\gamma z} = \frac{\tau\omega(z)}{1+\gamma\omega(z)} = w_{\tau,\gamma}(\omega(z)),$$

this shows

$$-\beta\,\overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma} = -\beta\, w_{\tau,\gamma}(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \subseteq w_{\tau,\gamma}(\mathbb{D}) = \Omega_{\tau,\gamma}$$

for every zero β of Q. This implies $P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_n(\Omega_{\tau,\gamma})$ by the Grace-Szegö convolution theorem.

On the other hand, our considerations show that if Q of degree n has a zero $\beta \notin I_\gamma$, then there is an $\alpha \in \overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma}$ such that $-\alpha\beta \notin \Omega_{\tau,\gamma}$. For such an α the polynomial

$$P(z) := (1 - z/\alpha)^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} (-\alpha)^{-k} z^k$$

is of degree n with all zeros in $\overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma}$ and we have

$$(P *_{GS} Q)(z) = Q(-z/\alpha)$$

Hence, in this case $P *_{GS} Q$ has a zero at $-\alpha\beta$ which is not in $\Omega_{\tau,\gamma}$. This proves Theorem 20a and the proof of (b) is so similar that it can be omitted.

If $P \in \pi_n(\overline{I}_\gamma)$ and $Q \in \pi_n(I_\gamma)$, then by (a) we have $R *_{GS} Q \in \pi_n(\Omega_{\tau,\gamma})$ for all $R \in \pi_n(\overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma})$, and consequently, by (b), $R *_{GS} Q *_{GS} P \in \pi_n(\Omega_{\tau,\gamma})$ for all such R. Another application of (a) shows that $P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_n(I_\gamma)$. On the other hand, if Q of degree n is such that $P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_n(I_\gamma)$ for all $P \in \pi_n(\overline{I}_\gamma)$, then in particular

$$Q(z) = (1+z)^n *_{GS} Q(z) \in \pi_n(I_\gamma),$$

since $-1 \in \overline{I}_\gamma$. This proves Theorem 20e.

Suppose now that Q of degree $\le n$ is such that $P *_{GS} Q \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{\Omega}_{\tau,\gamma})$ for all $P \in \pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega_{\tau,\gamma})$. Since $P \mapsto R := P^{*n}$ is a bijection between $\pi_{\le n}(\mathbb{C} \setminus \Omega_{\tau,\gamma})$ and $\pi_n(\overline{\Omega}_{(\gamma^2-1)/\overline{\tau},\gamma})$, this holds if, and only if,

$$R *_{GS} Q^{*n} = (P *_{GS} Q)^{*n} \in \pi_n(\Omega_{(\gamma^2-1)/\overline{\tau},\gamma})$$

for all $R \in \pi_n(\overline{\Omega}_{(\gamma^2-1)/\overline{\tau},\gamma})$. Because of Statement (a) this is equivalent to $Q^{*n} \in \pi_n(I_\gamma)$. Since $Q^{*n} \mapsto Q$ is a bijection between $\pi_n(I_\gamma)$ and $\pi_{\le n}(O_\gamma)$, we have verified (c). The two remaining statements of Theorem 20 are shown in a similar fashion, and the proof of the theorem is thus complete. □

References

1. G.E. Andrews, R. Askey, and R. Roy, *Special functions*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 71, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
2. J. Borcea and P. Brändén, *Pólya-Schur master theorems for circular domains and their boundaries*, Ann. of Math. (2) **170** (2009), no. 1, 465–492.
3. J.H. Grace, *The zeros of a polynomial*, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **11** (1900–1902), 352–357.
4. G. Herglotz, *Über Potenzreihen mit positivem, reellem Teil im Einheitskreis.*, Leipz. Ber. **63** (1911), 501–511.
5. V. Kac and P. Cheung, *Quantum calculus*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
6. M. Lamprecht, *Suffridge's convolution theorem for polynomials and entire functions having only real zeros*, arXiv:1210.1102 [math.CA].

7. ———, *Interspersion in Suffridge's polynomial theory*, Comput. Methods Funct. Theory **11** (2011), no. 1, 325–351.
8. G. Pólya and I. J. Schoenberg, *Remarks on de la Vallée Poussin means and convex conformal maps of the circle*, Pacific J. Math. **8** (1958), 295–334.
9. Q. I. Rahman and G. Schmeisser, *Analytic theory of polynomials*, London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, vol. 26, The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
10. S. Ruscheweyh, *Linear operators between classes of prestarlike functions*, Comment. Math. Helv. **52** (1977), no. 4, 497–509.
11. ———, *Convolutions in geometric function theory*, Séminaire de Mathématiques Supérieures [Seminar on Higher Mathematics], vol. 83, Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Montreal, Que., 1982, Fundamental Theories of Physics.
12. S. Ruscheweyh and L. Salinas, *Universally prestarlike functions as convolution multipliers.*, Math. Z. **263** (2009), no. 3, 607–617.
13. ———, *New Pólya-Schoenberg type theorems*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **363** (2010), no. 2, 481–496.
14. S. Ruscheweyh, L. Salinas, and T. Sugawa, *Completely monotone sequences and universally prestarlike functions*, Israel J. Math. **171** (2009), no. 1, 285–304.
15. S. Ruscheweyh and T. Sheil-Small, *Hadamard products of Schlicht functions and the Pólya-Schoenberg conjecture*, Comment. Math. Helv. **48** (1973), 119–135.
16. T. Sheil-Small, *The Hadamard product and linear transformations of classes of analytic functions.*, J. Anal. Math. **34** (1978), 204–239.
17. ———, *Complex polynomials*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 75, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.
18. T. J. Suffridge, *Starlike functions as limits of polynomials*, Advances in complex function theory (Proc. Sem., Univ. Maryland, College Park, Md., 1973–1974), Springer, Berlin, 1976, pp. 164–203. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 505.
19. G. Szegö, *Bemerkungen zu einem Satz von J. H. Grace über die Wurzeln algebraischer Gleichungen.*, Math. Zeitschr. **13** (1922), 28–55.

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, European University of Cyprus, Diogenous Str. 6, Engomi, P.O. Box: 22006, 1516 Nicosia, Cyprus
E-mail address: m.lamprecht@euc.ac.cy

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Cyprus, P.O. Box: 20537, 1678 Nicosia, Cyprus
E-mail address: lmartin@ucy.ac.cy